Remarks

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Claims 1-15 and 31 remain pending.

In the Office Action, dated May 8, 2008, claims 1-6, 8-15, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siamak et al. (EP 0969,371) in view of Carlson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,133,907); and claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siamak et al. in view of Carlson et al. and further in view of Wilson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,454). Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse these rejections for the reasons below.

In accordance with an aspect of the present invention, a capability is provided for facilitating the configuring of communications environments. In one example, logical CHPID numbers are assigned to physical channels in a manner that minimizes single points of failure or single points of repair. An automatic linkage of a logical definition of a channel to a physical channel is selected that best exploits the reliability, availability, and serviceability of an environment. Advantageously, the assignments can be made prior to the machine being installed or the I/O being installed.

In one particular example, applicants claim a method of facilitating configuring of resources of a communications environment (e.g., independent claim 1). The method includes, for instance, automatically mapping a first identifier of a resource of a machine being configured to a second identifier of the resource to assign a physical path of the resource to a logical path of the resource, wherein the first identifier is usable by hardware to identify the resource and the second identifier is usable by a program of the machine to identify the resource, and wherein the mapping is based on the physical structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair.

Thus, in this aspect of applicants' claimed invention, a first identifier of a resource of a machine being configured is mapped to a second identifier of the resource to assign a physical path of the resource to a logical path of that resource. This mapping is based on the physical structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or

single points of repair. This is not described, taught or suggested in Siamak or Carlson, either alone or in combination.

Siamak reads device identifiers from storage devices in a computer system and uses the device identifiers to create a mapping associating the device identifiers with corresponding physical paths to the storage devices. Upon reconfiguration of the storage devices, the computer system again reads device identifiers from storage devices in order to verify that that the system was reconfigured correctly. So, in Siamak when there is a reconfiguration, the system uses a mapping file to determine if there was a mistake made during the reconfiguration. There is, however, no description, teaching or suggestion in Siamak of mapping logical identifiers to physical identifiers, wherein the mapping is based on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair, as claimed by applicants. Siamak makes no reference to single points of failure or single points of repair in describing or creating its mapping table (see, e.g., paragraphs 19-24 of Siamak).

Since Siamak fails to disclose at least applicants' claimed element of automatically mapping a first identifier based on the physical structure of a machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair, as explicitly admitted in the Office Action, Carlson is relied upon. However, Carlson does not overcome the deficiencies of Siamak.

While Carlson describes configuring system resources, there is no description, teaching or suggestion in Carlson of automatically mapping identifiers. Further, there is no description, teaching or suggestion in Carlson of automatically mapping identifiers based on the physical structure of a machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair. Since both Siamak and Carlson fail to describe, teach or suggest this aspect of applicants' claimed invention, applicants respectfully submit that the combination also fails to describe, teach or suggest this aspect.

The combination of Siamak and Carlson, *assuming arguendo* the combination is proper, merely describes that an identifier may be mapped and that resources may be configured. However, there is no correlation between the two in the combination. The combination does not suggest that the mapping of an identifier is based on the physical

structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair. The combination simply indicates that identifiers may be mapped in some fashion, and that resources can be configured to provide redundancy.

Since the combination of Siamak and Carlson fails to describe, teach or suggest at least applicants' claimed element of automatically mapping a first identifier based on the physical structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for independent claim 1. Further, the dependent claims are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional features.

For all of the above reasons, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with applicants' attorney, please contact applicants' attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller

Blanche E. Schiller
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 35,670

Dated: June 17, 2008

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203-5160
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579